

## Interview Summary

Application No.

10/075,541

Applicant(s)

MIYAMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph C. Merek

Art Unit

3727

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph C. Merek.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) J. Adam Neff.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 23 January 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: Havens et al, Abrums, Roop, and Andress et al '026.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: It was proposed that the independent claims be amended to include the limitation that the attachment projections have a centerline that when viewed in cross-section is oblique with respect to the surface from which it extends. A drawing objection may be raised since the centerline is not currently noted in the drawings. It was also proposed to include in the independent claims the limitation to two sets of attachment projections on the cover. The examiner suggested defining how the two sets are related to each other on the cover. These limitations would overcome the rejection of record. Havens et al appears to teach the oblique centerline.